

Appl. No. : 10/642,799
Filed : August 18, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 113-119 were pending in this application. Claims 113 and 119 are herein amended to clarify Applicants' claimed invention. New Claims 120-127 are herein added. No new matter is added by these amendments. Accordingly, Claims 113-127 are now pending.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. The Examiner's reasons for rejection are addressed below.

Amendments to the claims

Claim 113 has been amended to clarify the invention. Claim 113, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "providing one or more dividing structures to substantially fluidly separate a region immediately above the susceptor from a region immediately below the susceptor" and "supporting the susceptor on a plurality of support arms, each of the support arms comprising a first portion that extends generally radially outward from an upper section of a substantially vertical shaft and a second portion that extends generally upward from the first portion, wherein a central vertical axis of the shaft is aligned with a central vertical axis of the susceptor, the second portion of each of the arms engaging the susceptor such that rotation of the shaft about the central vertical axis of the shaft causes the susceptor to rotate about the central vertical axis of the susceptor." This amendment is fully supported by the application as originally filed ("the Application"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198153, at, for example, paragraphs [0068] and [0074], and Figure 1.

Claim 119 has been amended for consistency with amended Claim 113.

New Claims 120-127 have been added. The new claims are fully supported by the Application at, for example, paragraphs [0012] and [0078], and Figures 2 and 3.

Section 102 rejections

Claims 113-117 and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 2181458 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson"), in particular Fig. 4 thereof. Johnson's apparatus includes a pedestal 80 comprising a vertical shaft portion that conveys a gas 13, and a horizontal *plate* centered about and projecting radially from a top portion of the vertical shaft portion. A

Appl. No. : 10/642,799
Filed : August 18, 2003

susceptor 15 is supported by risers 81 that project *vertically* from the horizontal plate. See Johnson, Figures 1 and 4; page 3, lines 13-28.

Applicants submit that Claim 113, as amended, is allowable over Johnson because Johnson does not teach or disclose 1) a plurality of support arms, each of the support arms comprising a first portion that extends generally radially outward from an upper section of a substantially vertical shaft and a second portion that extends generally upward from the first portion, and 2) one or more dividing structures that substantially fluidly separate a region immediately above a susceptor from a region immediately below the susceptor. First, the horizontal plate of Johnson's pedestal 80 is not equivalent to Applicants' support arms' first portions. Second, the risers of Johnson do not extend generally radially outward from an upper section of Johnson's vertical shaft. As noted above, the risers of Johnson, at most, project vertically from the horizontal plate of Johnson. Third, with reference to Figures 2 and 3 of Johnson, a region immediately above Johnson's susceptor 15 is *not* substantially fluidly separated from a region immediately below Johnson's susceptor 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §102(b) rejection of Claim 113 be withdrawn.

Claims 114-117 and 119 depend from and therefore include all of the limitations of amended Claim 113, in addition to reciting additional features of particular advantage and utility. Johnson does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 113, let alone the unique combinations of limitations of Claims 114-117 and 119. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §102(b) rejections of Claims 114-117 and 119 also be withdrawn.

Section 103 rejection

Claim 118 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,343,012 to Hardy et al. ("Hardy") or alternatively in view of JP 05013350 to Fukazawa ("Fukazawa").

Claim 118 depends from and therefore includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 113, in addition to reciting additional features of particular advantage and utility. Hardy and Fukazawa are cited for the specific recitation of limitations of Claim 118, and do not teach the deficiency of Johnson with respect to amended Claim 113. Thus, the cited combination of references does not include or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 113 (see above),

Appl. No. : 10/642,799
Filed : August 18, 2003

let alone the unique combinations of limitations of Claim 118. Note that Applicants expressly do not acquiesce with respect to this rejection of Claim 118; nevertheless, this rejection is moot for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of Claim 118 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. If there is any further hindrance to allowance of the pending claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 3/1/06

By: Sanjivpal S. Gill
Sanjivpal S. Gill
Registration No. 42,578
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114

2408488
030106